REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 34-43, 95 and 109-122 remain pending in this application. Claims 115 to 122 have been amended to depend from claim 34.

Rejections

Claims 34-43, 95, 109-114 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for failure to distinctly point out and claim the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Action maintains that the term "steroid hormone-like" is indefinite. The claims have been amended to further clarify the nature of the steroid responsiveness of the cells. As such, the Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

As regards the term "substantially devoid," Applicant traverses the rejection, but has amended the claims to move forward prosecution in this case. As such, the Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 37 has been amended to address the new grounds for rejection.

Claims 34-39, 41-43, 95, 109-114 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant incorporated by reference the statements made as regards the indefiniteness rejection. Applicant believes that the claims, as amended, overcome the present rejection. Briefly, the claims as amended address the issues related to claim scope, which share a nucleus of facts with enablement. The claims have been amended to specifically address the nature of the immunoglobulins as being secreted immunoglobulins that have a specific effect, that is, they inhibit steroid hormone activity. It is indeed a surprising finding that these secreted immunoglobulins were able to have the activity that had, heretofore, been unknown. As for the search for the serum inhibitors, Applicant notes that it is, in fact, secreted immunoglobulins that have traversed the secretory epithelium (along with secretory component) that have been found to have the activity, not serum borne inhibitors. The claims have been amended accordingly. Finally, it is not possible at this point to distinguish between those immunoglobulins that have the anti-steroidal effect, however, the limitations include that the immunoglobulins have been secreted (thereby limiting the isotypes of immunoglobulins involved) and the heretofore unknown effect.

As such, the Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 34-39, 41-43, 95, 109-114 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for lack of sufficient written description. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The arguments and evidence presented hereinabove is also incorporated herein by reference, as lack of written description rejections often overlap with the common nucleus of facts addressed in response to enablement rejections. Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the present rejections.

As such, the specification satisfies the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. For the reasons mentioned above, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Conclusion

In light of the Amendments and argument, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, or if further clarification is required, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: December 14, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin S. Flores
Reg. No. 38,453
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Customer No. 34, 725
Chalker Flores, LLP
2711 Lyndon Baines Johnson Fwy, Suite 1036
Dallas, TX 75234
214.866.0001 Telephone
214.866.0010 Facsimile